

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 07383 231831Z

43/42

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 061990

P R 221212Z SEP 76 CORRECTED COPY FOR MCN

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3173

INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 7383

EXDIS/SALT

C O R R E C T E D C O P Y (FROM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA VICE
USDEL SALT II GENEVA)

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: AMBASSADOR JOHNSON'S STATEMENT OF SEPTEMBER 22, 1976
(SALT TWO-1088)

THE FOLLOWING IS STATEMENT DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR JOHNSON
AT THE SALT TWO MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 22, 1976.

QUOTE:

MR. MINISTER:

TODAY I WANT TO DISCUSS THE PROPOSALS THE TWO DELEGATIONS HAVE MADE
WITH RESPECT TO THE LIMITATION IN THE NEW AGREEMENT ON THE NUMBER OF
LAUNCHERS OF MISSILES EQUIPPED WITH MIRVS, AND THE VERIFICATION BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS OF COMPLIANCE WITH THAT LIMITATION.

PRIOR TO THE RECENT RECESS, EACH DELEGATION TABLED A NEW PROPOSAL
WITH RESPECT TO THE MIRV LIMITATION, THE SOVIET DELEGATION ON JUNE 23

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 07383 231831Z

AND THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION ON JULY 7. THE LANGUAGE PROPOSED BY

THE SIDES IS IDENTICAL IN SOME PARTS OF THESE PROPOSALS, INDICATING T
HE
PROGRESS WHICH THE DELEGATIONS HAVE MADE TOWARD REACHING AGREEMENT O
N
THIS QUESTION. WITH THE EXCEPTION TO THE REFERENCE TO ASBMS, THE SIDE
S
HAVE TABLED IDENTICAL LANGUAGE FOR PARAGRAPH 1 OF ARTICLE V, WHICH CO
N-
TAINS THE BASIC 1320 MIRV AGGREGATE LIMITATION. ALSO, THE SIDES ARE I
N
AGREEMENT ON THE LANGUAGE FOR AN AGREED STATEMENT DESCRIBING REENTRY
VEHICLES WHICH ARE "INDEPENDENTLY TARGETABLE."

HOWEVER, A COMPARISON OF THE TWO DELEGATIONS' PROPOSALS ALSO REVEALS
AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT. IT IS THESE AREAS WHICH I WANT TO DISCUSS TODA
Y.

THE DIFFERENCES THAT REMAIN PRIMARILY RELATE TO TWO QUESTIONS. WHICH
BALLISTIC MISSILES ARE TO BE CONSIDERED MISSILES EQUIPPED WITH MIRVS?
AND
WHICH LAUNCHERS ARE TO BE CONSIDERED LAUNCHERS OF MISSILES EQUIPPED
WITH MIRVS? I WILL ADDRESS THESE QUESTIONS IN THAT ORDER.

II

SOME TYPES OF BALLISTIC MISSILES--FOR EXAMPLE, THE SOVIET ICBM
WHICH THE US CALLS THE SS-18--HAVE BEEN FLIGHT TESTED BOTH WITH MIRVS
AND WITHOUT MIRVS. IT IS THE US VIEW THAT, IN ORDER TO ENSURE ADEQUAT
E
VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE MIRV LIMITATION, ALL MISSILES WIT
H
BOOSTERS OF A TYPE WHICH HAS BEEN FLIGHT-TESTED WITH MIRVS, WHETHER O
R
NOT IT HAS ALSO BEEN FLIGHT-TESTED WITHOUT MIRVS, MUST BE CONSIDERED
MISSILES EQUIPPED WITH MIRVS. ACCORDINGLY, THE US PROPOSAL FOR PARA-
GRAPH 5 OF ARTICLE II DEFINES MIRV LAUNCHERS AS LAUNCHERS FOR LAUNCHI
NG
A MISSILE "WITH A BOOSTER WHICH IS OF A TYPE THAT HAS BEEN FLIGHT-
TESTED ONE OR MORE TIMES" WITH MIRVS. THUS, FOR EXAMPLE, ALL SS-18S
WOULD BE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 07383 231831Z

CONSIDERED MIRVED MISSILES.

THE SOVIET LANGUAGE FOR PARAGRAPH 5 OF ARTICLE II SPEAKS OF "MISSILES
WITH" MIRVS. IN THE ABSENCE OF FURTHER ELABORATION, THE US WOULD
INTERPRET THIS TO MEAN THAT EACH MISSILE WOULD HAVE TO BE JUDGED INDI
-
VIDUALLY AS BEING MIRVED OR NOT. WHILE THERE HAS BEEN MENTION OF THE
POSSIBILITY OF AN AGREED STATEMENT RECORDING WHICH MISSILES ARE

EQUIPPED WITH MIRVS, FURTHER ELABORATION IS NEEDED TO SHOW HOW THIS STATEMENT WOULD RESOLVE THE QUESTION OF WHICH MISSILES WOULD BE CONSIDERED MIRVED MISSILES UNDER THE NEW AGREEMENT.

III

THE SECOND QUESTION CONCERNS THE ASSOCIATION OF MIRVED MISSILES WITH LAUNCHERS. THIS ASSOCIATION IS NECESSARY BECAUSE THE MIRV AGGREGATE LIMITATION APPLIES TO ICBM AND SLBM LAUNCHERS RATHER THAN TO ICBMS AND SLBMS. THE ESSENCE OF THE US POSITION IN THIS REGARD IS REFLECTED IN A PROPOSED AGREED STATEMENT TO THE EFFECT THAT A LAUNCHER WILL BE CONSIDERED A MIRV LAUNCHER IF ANY LAUNCHER OF THE SAME TYPE HAS EVER CONTAINED OR LAUNCHED A MIRVED MISSILE. FURTHER, THE US HAS PROPOSED THAT IN ANOTHER AGREED STATEMENT THE SIDES RECORD THE TYPES OF CURRENT LAUNCHERS TO BE MIRV LAUNCHERS AND THOSE CONSIDERED NOT TO BE MIRV LAUNCHERS.

THE SOVIET PROPOSALS FOR PARAGRAPH 5 OF ARTICLE II DEFINES MIRV LAUNCHERS AS LAUNCHERS "WHEREIN ARE DEPLOYED" MIRVED MISSILES. IS THE SOVIET PROPOSAL TO BE INTERPRETED TO MEAN THAT A LAUNCHER WOULD BE CONSIDERED SUBJECT TO THE LIMITATION OF ARTICLE V IF, AND ONLY IF, IT CONTAINS OR HAS CONTAINED A MIRVED MISSILE? FURTHER, DOES THE SOVIET PROPOSAL MEAN THAT IF A PARTICULAR LAUNCHER IS OF THE SAME TYPE AS ANOTHER LAUNCHER WHICH HAS CONTAINED OR LAUNCHED A MIRVED MISSILE, THIS WOULD NOT PROVIDE A BASIS FOR CONSIDERING THAT PARTICULAR LAUNCHER

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 SALT T 07383 231831Z

SUBJECT TO THE MIRV LIMITATION?

MR. MINISTER, I BELIEVE THAT IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE DELEGATIONS UNDERSTAND NOT ONLY THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO SIDES, BUT ALSO THE PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES OF THOSE DIFFERENCES. IT WAS TO THIS END THAT THE US DELEGATION, ON MARCH 23, MADE MENTION OF THE SOVIET ICBM LAUNCHERS IN THE ICBM LAUNCH COMPLEXES NEAR DERAZHNYA AND PERVOMAYSK IN THE UKRAINIAN S.S.R. OUR OBSERVATIONS OF THESE LAUNCHERS INDICATE THAT SOME OF THEM WERE CONSTRUCTED PRIOR TO 1970 AND SUBSEQUENTLY WERE CHANGED, OR ARE BEING CHANGED, TO THE CONFIGURATION OF THE TYPE WE ASSOCIATE WITH THE MIRVED ICBM WE CALL THE SS-19. IN THE US VIEW, THESE LAUNCHERS WOULD BE CONSIDERED MIRV LAUNCHERS. UNDER SOVIET APPROACH WOULD THESE LAUNCHERS BE SUBJECT TO THE MIRV LIMITATION?

OUR OBSERVATIONS FURTHER INDICATE THAT THE OTHER ICBM LAUNCHERS NEAR DERAZHNYA AND PERVOMAYSK WERE CONSTRUCTED AFTER 1970 ALSO IN THE CONFIGURATION OF THE TYPE WE ASSOCIATE WITH THE SS-19. IN THE US VIEW, THESE LAUNCHERS ALSO WOULD BE CONSIDERED MIRV LAUNCHERS. UNDER THE SOVIET APPROACH WOULD THESE LAUNCHERS BE SUBJECT TO THE MIRV LIMITATION?

MR. MINISTER, I ASK THESE QUESTIONS IN ORDER TO DETERMINE THAT EXTENT OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN US ON THIS ISSUE. IF UNDER THE SOVIET APPROACH ALL OF THE ICBM LAUNCHERS NEAR DERAZHNYA AND PERVOMAYSK WOULD BE CONSIDERED MIRV LAUNCHERS, THEN THERE IS IN FACT LITTLE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN US. IF, ON THE OTHER HAND, UNDER THE SOVIET APPROACH NOT ALL OF THOSE LAUNCHERS WOULD BE CONSIDERED MIRV LAUNCHERS, IT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO KNOW THE BASIS FOR THE DISTINCTION WHICH IS MADE BETWEEN THOSE WHICH ARE CONSIDERED MIRV LAUNCHERS AND THOSE WHICH ARE NOT. UNQUOTE.
JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: AMBASSADORS, SPEECHES, SALT (ARMS CONTROL), ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 22 SEP 1976
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: saccheem
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976SALTT07383
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760359-1121
From: SALT TALKS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19760932/aaaabbdu.tel
Line Count: 189
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: saccheem
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 12 MAY 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <12 MAY 2004 by greeneet>; APPROVED <09 SEP 2004 by saccheem>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: AMBASSADOR JOHNSON'S STATEMENT OF SEPTEMBER 22, 1976 (SALT TWO-1088) THE FOLLOWING IS STATEMENT DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR
TAGS: PARM, US, UR, (JOHNSON, U ALEXIS)
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006